

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: KLAUS BIESTER	§	ART UNIT: 3679
	§	
SERIAL NO : 10/525,934	§	
	§	EXAMINER:
FILED: February 25, 2005	§	David Bochna
	§	
FOR: CONNECTING MECHANISM	§	CONFIRMATION NO.: 4984

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**  
**CONDUCTED SEPTEMBER 24, 2007**

Atty. Dkt. No.: 1600-11900  
Clk. Ref. No.: OTE-030477  
Customer No. 45933  
Date: October 29, 2007

Mail Stop Issue Fee  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant acknowledges receipt of the *Notice of Allowability* and the *Interview Summary Form* dated October 15, 2007. In response, Applicant submits this Statement of the Substance of an Interview conducted September 24, 2007.

REMARKS

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the telephonic interview conducted September 24, 2007 between Examiner David Bochna and the attorney for Applicant, David A. Rose of Conley Rose, P.C.

In the Office Action dated January 16, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 10 and 31 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant in its response to the office action attempted to rewrite claims 10 and 31 in independent form. In the final Office Action dated July 9, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 10 and 31 as being anticipated by the prior art because the Examiner objected to Applicant's attempt to rewrite claims 10 and 31 in independent form including the limitations of independent claim 1. In Applicant's response to the final Office Action dated July 9, 2007, Applicant amended claims 10 and 31 so as to comport with the Examiner's objections as to the way the claims 10 and 31 had been previously rewritten in independent form. However, in an advisory action dated September 18, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 10 and 31 stating that they would require further consideration and/or search. Applicant's attorney and the Examiner had a telephone interview on September 24, 2007 during which Applicant's attorney explained the above history of claims 10 and 31. Subsequently upon further review by the Examiner, the Examiner determined that the amendments in Applicant's response to the final Office Action placed the case in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



---

DAVID A. ROSE  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
P. O. Box 3267  
Houston, Texas 77253-3267  
(713) 238-8000  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

CAMERON INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION  
P O Box 1212  
Houston, Texas 77251